



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

| SERIAL NUMBER | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|---------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

07/911,752 07/10/92 URSICH

N 710-P-304

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3202

DATE MAILED: 03/10/93

EDWARD D. GILHOOLY, LTD.  
53 W. JACKSON BLVD., STE. 1516  
CHICAGO, IL 60604

32M1

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.  
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☐ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 12/23/92 ☒ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.  
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.                   |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.                 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.     | 6. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Interview Summary PTO-413</u>          |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1, 4-10 are rejected.

5. ☒ Claims 2-3 are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received  
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 322

1. Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

2. Claim 4, in the last paragraph, the recited feature "said balls" throughout the paragraph lacks proper antecedent basis. In claims 8, and 9 the recited feature "said resilient means" also lacks proper antecedent basis.

Claim 10, on line 2, the word-socket-<sup>should</sup>~~be~~ inserted before the word "receptor".

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Art Unit 322

4. Claims ~~1, 10, 11~~ rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Mc eneaney in view of Dennis or Janowiec.

5. Mc eneaney discloses a locking female receptor C having a pair of holes for receiving the spaced prongs 10 of a plug A. Mc eneaney's receptor lacks electrical lines coupled to the receptor body. However, Dennis and Janowiec both disclose that it is old and well known in the art to connect electrical lines to a female receptor body (for example, see electrical lines 10 of Janowiec coupled to his receptor body P). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide electrical lines coupled to the receptor body of Mc eneaney in view of the teachings of Dennis or Janowiec. Electrical lines coupled to Mc eneaney's receptor C would allow the receptor to function as an electrical socket connector for the male plug A.

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims ~~1, 10~~ have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

7. Claims 2-3 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit 322

8. Claims 4-9 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Khiem Nguyen at telephone number (703) 308-1738.

*K. Nguyen*

Nguyen/msm  
March 08, 1993

*L. Schwartz*

Larry I. Schwartz  
SPE  
Art Unit 322